	Case 1:21-cv-00303-NONE-SKO Docume	ent 11 Fi	led 03/10/21	Page 1 of 2
1				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	ARMANDO ABREU,	Case No	o. 1:21-cv-00303	3-NONE-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	OPPER		IOMION FOR
13	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL		
14	GAVIN NEWSOM, et al.,	(Doc. 9)		
15	Defendants.			
16				
17	Plaintiff Armando Abreu is a state prison appearing pro se in this civil rights action			
18	brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He requests the appointment of counsel to represent him in			
19	this case. (Doc. 9.)			
20	Plaintiffs do not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in section 1983 actions,			
21	Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the Court cannot require an attorney			
22	to represent a party under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), see Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296,			
23	304-05 (1989). However, in "exceptional circumstances," the Court may request the voluntary			
24	assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.			
25	Given that the Court has no reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the			
26	Court will seek volunteer counsel only in extraordinary cases. In determining whether			
27	"exceptional circumstances exist, a district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success on			
28	the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to	articulate l	his claims pro s	e in light of the

complexity of the legal issues involved." *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Even if it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and has made serious allegations that, if proven, would entitle him to relief, his case is not extraordinary. The Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. In addition, at this stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination on whether Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits; and, based on a review of the records in this case, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. 1st Sheila K. Oberto Dated: March 9, 2021 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 1:21-cv-00303-NONE-SKO Document 11 Filed 03/10/21 Page 2 of 2